arXiv:1608.02389v2 [cs.DM] 25 Aug 2016

On H-Topological Intersection Graphs*

Steven Chaplick[1], Martin Töpfer[2], Jan Voborník[2], and Peter Zeman[2]

1 **Lehrstuhl für Informatik I, Universität Würzburg, Germany.**
steven.chaplick@uni-wuerzburg.de.
2 **Computer Science Institute, Charles University in Prague, Czech Republic.**
{topfer,voborknik,zeman}@iuuk.mff.cuni.cz.

Abstract

Biró, Hujter, and Tuza introduced the concept of H-graphs (1992), intersection graphs of connected subgraphs of a subdivision of a graph H. They naturally generalize many important classes of graphs, e.g., interval graphs and circular-arc graphs. Our paper is the first study of the recognition and dominating set problems of this large collection of intersection classes of graphs.

We negatively answer the question of Biró, Hujter, and Tuza who asked whether H-graphs can be recognized in polynomial time, for a fixed graph H. Namely, we show that when H is the diamond graph, the recognition problem is NP-complete. However, for each tree T, we give a polynomial-time algorithm for recognizing T-graphs and an $\mathcal{O}(n^4)$-time algorithm for recognizing star-graphs, i.e., when T is $K_{1,t}$ for some t. For the dominating set problem (parameterized by the size of H), we give FPT- and XP-time algorithms on star-graphs and H-graphs, respectively. Our dominating set algorithm for H-graphs also provides XP- time algorithms for the independent set and independent dominating set problems on H-graphs (again parameterized by $\|H\|$).

1998 ACM Subject Classification G.2.2 Graph Theory, I.1.2 Algorithms

Keywords and phrases H-graphs, recognition, dominating set, maximum clique, coloring

Digital Object Identifier 10.4230/LIPIcs..2016.23

1 Introduction

An intersection representation of a graph assigns a set to each vertex and uses intersections of those sets to encode its edges. More formally, an intersection representation $\mathcal{R}$ of a graph G is a collection of sets $\{R_v : v \in V(G)\}$ such that $R_u \cap R_v \neq \emptyset$ if and only if $uv \in E(G)$. Many important classes of graphs are obtained by restricting the sets R_v to geometric objects (e.g., intervals, convex sets).

In this work, we study intersection graphs arising from fixed topological patterns imposed on the set elements as introduced by Biró, Hujter, and Tuza [1]. For a graph H, we study the graphs G which have intersection representations by connected subgraphs of a subdivision of H – such a graph is called an *H-graph*. We obtain new algorithmic results on the recognition and dominating set problem on these graph classes (as summarized in Section 1.2). We begin by discussing some closely related classic graph classes.

Interval Graphs. The *interval graphs* (INT) form one of the most studied and well-understood classes of intersection graphs. In an *interval representation* of a graph, each set R_v is a closed interval of the real line; see Fig. 1a. The vast body of work involving interval graphs (and their generalizations) stems from the fact that many important computational

*The last three authors were supported by the grant SVV–2016–260332.

© Steven Chaplick, Martin Töpfer, Jan Voborník, and Peter Zeman;
licensed under Creative Commons License CC-BY

problems can be solved efficiently on them. Recognition of interval graphs in linear time was a long-standing open problem solved by Booth and Lueker using PQ-trees [3] which can be used to describe the structure of all representations. Moreover, other important problems are solvable in linear time on interval graphs. These include, for example, the problem of finding a minimum dominating set [5], and the graph isomorphism problem [15].

Chordal Graphs. A graph is *chordal* when it does not have an induced cycle of length at least four. This definition is not particularly useful for algorithmic results, but has given rise to many characterizations which are better suited to the task. For example one by Gavril [9], which states that a graph is chordal if and only if it can be represented as an intersection graph of subtrees of some tree; see Fig. 1b. An immediate consequence of this is that INT is a subclass of the chordal graphs (CHOR).

While the recognition problem can be solved easily in linear time for chordal graphs [16] and such algorithms can be used to generate an intersection representation by subtrees of a tree, asking for special host trees can be more difficult. For example, for a given graph G and tree T it is NP-complete to decide whether G is a T-graph [14]. On the other hand, for a given graph G, if one would like to find a tree T with the fewest leaves such that G is a T-graph, it can be done in polynomial time [13] (this is known as the *leafage* problem). However, for any fixed $d \geq 3$, if one would like to find a tree T where G is a T-graph and, for each vertex v, the subtree for v has at most d leaves, the problem again becomes NP-complete [6] (this is known as the *d-vertex leafage* problem). The minimum vertex leafage problem can be solved in $n^{O(\ell)}$-time via a somewhat elaborate enumeration of *minimal*[1] tree representations of G with exactly ℓ leaves where ℓ is the leafage of G [6].

Additionally, some computational problems become harder on chordal graphs than interval graphs. Finding a minimum dominating set is NP-complete [4] on chordal graphs. The graph isomorphism problem is GI-complete on chordal graphs [15], i.e., it is as hard as the general graph isomorphism problem. On the other hand, the minimum coloring, maximum independent set, and maximum clique problems are all solvable in linear time on CHOR.

An important subclass of chordal graphs are split graphs (SPLIT). A graph is a *split graph* if it can be partitioned into maximal clique and an independent set. Note that every split graph can be represented as an intersection graph of subtrees of a *star* S_d, where S_d is the complete bipartite graph $K_{1,d}$.

Circular-Arc Graphs. These are a natural generalization of interval graphs. Here, each set R_v corresponds to an *arc of a circle*. This class is denoted by CARC. An important subclass of circular-arc graphs are Helly circular-arc graphs. A graph G is a *Helly circular-arc graph* if the collection of circular arcs $\mathcal{R} = \{R_v : v \in V(G)\}$ satisfies *Helly property*, i.e., for each sub-collection of $\mathcal{R}$ whose sets pairwise intersect, their common intersection is non-empty. Interestingly, it is NP-hard to compute a minimum coloring on Helly CARC [10].



Figure 1 (a) An interval graph and one of its interval representation. (b) A chordal graph and one of its representation as an intersection graph of subtrees of a tree.

[1] where each node of T corresponds to a maximal clique of G

1.1 H-graphs

Biró, Hujter, and Tuza [1] introduced the concept of an *H-graph*. Let H be a fixed graph. A graph G is an *intersection graph of H* if it is an intersection graph of connected subgraphs of H, i.e., for $u, v \in V(G)$, the assigned subgraphs H_v and H_u of H share a vertex if and only if $uv \in E(G)$.

A *subdivision* H' of a graph H is obtained when the edges of H are replaced by internally disjoint path of arbitrary lengths, i.e., an edge uv of H corresponds to a path from u to v in H' such that all internal vertices on this path have degree two. A graph G is a *topological intersection graph* of H if G is an intersection graph of a subdivision H' of H. We say that G is an *H-graph* and the collection $\{H'_v : v \in V(G)\}$ of connected subgraphs of H' is an *H-representation* of G. The class of all H-graphs is denoted by H-GRAPH. Additionally, a graph G is a *Helly H-graph* if it has an H-representation that satisfies the Helly property.

These graph classes were introduced in the context of the (p, k) *pre-coloring extension problem ((p, k)-PrColExt)*. Here one is given a graph G together with a p-coloring of $W \subseteq V(G)$, and the goal is to find a proper k-coloring of G containing this *pre-coloring*. They showed that, for interval graphs, when k is part of the input $(1, k)$-PrColExt can be solved in polynomial time, but $(2, k)$-PrColExt is NP-complete. On the other hand, they provided an XP (in k and $\|H\|$) algorithm to compute a (k, k)-PrColExt on H-GRAPH.

Notice that we have the following relations: INT $= K_2$-GRAPH, SPLIT $\subsetneq \bigcup_{d=2}^{\infty} S_d$-GRAPH, CARC $= K_3$-GRAPH, and CHOR $= \bigcup_{\text{Tree } T} T$-GRAPH. Biró, Hujter, and Tuza ask the following question which we answer negatively.

▶ **Problem 1** (Biró, Hujter, and Tuza [1], 1992)**.** Let H be an arbitrary fixed graph. Is there a polynomial algorithm testing whether a given graph G is an H-graph?

Hierarchy of H-GRAPH. Notice that, for any pair of (multi-)graphs H_1 and H_2, if H_1 is a *minor* of H_2, then H_1-GRAPH $\subseteq H_2$-GRAPH. Additionally, if H_1 is a subdivision of H_2, then H_1-GRAPH $= H_2$-GRAPH. In particular, we have an infinite hierarchy of graph classes between interval and chordal graphs since INT $\subsetneq$ CHOR, and for a tree T, we have T-GRAPH $\subsetneq$ CHOR. Since some interesting computational problems are polynomial on interval graphs and hard on chordal graphs, an interesting question is the complexity of those problems on T-graphs, for a fixed tree T.

Coloring H-GRAPH. Notice that, from the above discussion of CARC, if H contains a cycle, then computing a minimum colouring in H-GRAPH is already NP-hard even for Helly H-GRAPH. Additionally, when H does not contain a cycle (i.e., H is a forest), H-GRAPH is a subclass of the chordal graphs, i.e., a minimum colouring can be computed in linear time. Therefore, for a graph H, it is NP-hard to compute the minimum chromatic number on graphs in the class (Helly) H-GRAPH when H contains a cycle, and solvable in linear time when H is acyclic.

1.2 Our Results

We focus on three collections of classes of graphs: S_d-GRAPH, T-GRAPH, and H-GRAPH.

- *Recognition.* We negatively answer the question of Biró, Hujter, and Tuza (Problem 1). In Theorem 10, we prove that recognizing D-graphs (D is the diamond graph) is NP-complete by a reduction from the problem of determining if the interval dimension of a partial order of height 1 is at most 3. For each tree T, we give a polynomial-time algorithm for recognizing T-graphs and $\mathcal{O}(n^4)$-time algorithm for recognizing S_d-graphs (Theorem 7 and Theorem 9).

- *Dominating Set.* We solve the problem of finding a minimum dominating set on S_d-graphs (Theorem 12) in $\mathcal{O}(d \cdot 2^{d^2} + n \cdot (n+m))$ and for H-graphs (Theorem 13) in $n^{\mathcal{O}(\|H\|)}$.

1.3 Preliminaries

We assume that the reader is familiar with the following standard and parameterized computational complexity classes: NP, XP, and FPT(see, e.g., [7] for further details).

Let G be an T-graph, for some fixed tree T, and let $\mathcal{R}$ be an intersection representation of G on a subdivision T' of T. For a vertex $v \in V(G)$, the subgraph of T' corresponding to v is denoted by R_v. The vertices of T' with degree 1 and degree at least 3 are called *leaves* and *branching points*, respectively. Topologically, the paths between two branching points, or between a branching point and a leaf correspond to line segments, and branching points correspond to the points at which those line segments are connected. Let x, y be two vertices of T'. By $P_{[x,y]}$ we denote the path from x to y. Further, we define the path $P_{(x,y]} = P_{[x,y]} - x$. We define the paths $P_{[x,y)}$ and $P_{(x,y)}$ are defined analogously. If $X_1, \ldots, X_k$ are sets of vertices of a graph G then by $G[X_1, \ldots, X_k]$ we denote the subgraph of G induced by $X_1 \cup \cdots \cup X_k$.

In 1965, Fulkerson and Gross proved the following fundamental characterization of interval graphs by orderings of maximal cliques:

▶ **Lemma 2** (Fulkerson and Gross [8]). *A graph G is an interval graph if and only if there exists a linear ordering $\preceq$ of the maximal cliques of G such that for every $u \in V(G)$ the maximal cliques containing u appear consecutively in this ordering.*

2 Recognition of T-graphs

In this section we consider the recognition problem for the classes H-GRAPH where H is a tree. We first provide an $\mathcal{O}(n^4)$ algorithm which either finds the minimum d such that G is an S_d-graph, or reports that G has no such representation. We then provide an $n^{\mathcal{O}(\|T\|^2)}$-time algorithm to test whether, for a given graph G and a fixed tree T, G is a T-graph.

We begin with a lemma that motivates our general approach. It says that if G is a T-graph, then there exists a representation of G such that every branching point is contained in some maximal clique of G. The proof is given in Appendix B.

▶ **Lemma 3.** *Let G be a T-graph and let $\mathcal{R}$ be its intersection representation on a subdivision T' of T. Then $\mathcal{R}$ can be modified such that for every branching point $b \in V(T')$, we have $b \in \bigcap_{v \in C} V(R_v)$, for some maximal clique C of G.*

To avoid technical details, in the whole section, we will assume that we have a subdivision T' of the tree T that is sufficiently large to construct a representation of the input graph G (if it exists). Later, we will see that the size of T' is linear in the input. An actual algorithm would subdivide T gradually.

The General Approach. It is well-known that chordal graphs, and therefore also T-graphs, have at most n maximal cliques and that they can be found in linear time. According to Lemma 3, if G is a T-graph, then it has a representation such that every branching point of T is contained in the representation of $G[C]$, for some maximal clique of G.

Our approach is to try all possible mappings f of the branching points $\mathcal{B}$ of T' to the maximal cliques $\mathcal{C}$ of G. The number of such mappings is at most n^t, where n is the number of vertices of G and t is the number of vertices of T. Then for every mapping $f \colon \mathcal{B} \to \mathcal{C}$ we test whether there exists a representation of G with $b \in \bigcap_{v \in f(b)} V(R_v)$, for every $b \in \mathcal{B}$. To do this, we need to find a placement of the connected components of $G - \bigcup_{b \in \mathcal{B}} f(b)$ on the paths $T' - \mathcal{B}$ such that the following conditions hold:

- If $H_1, \ldots, H_k$ are the connected components placed on a path $P_{(b,l]}$ between a branching point $b \in \mathcal{B}$ and a leaf l, then the induced subgraph $G[f(b), V(H_1), \ldots, V(H_k)]$ has an interval representation with $f(b)$ being the leftmost maximal clique.
- If $H_1, \ldots, H_k$ are the connected components placed on a path $P_{(b,b')}$ between two branching points $b, b' \in \mathcal{B}$, then $G[f(b), V(H_1), \ldots, V(H_k), f(b')]$ has an interval representation with $f(b)$ and $f(b')$ being the leftmost and rightmost maximal cliques, respectively.

Recognition of S_d-graphs. We describe a polynomial-time algorithm for the recognition of S_d-graphs. In this case, the subdivision T' has one branching point b and d leaves $l_1, \ldots, l_d$. For every maximal clique C of G, we try to construct a representation $\mathcal{R}$ such that $b \in \bigcap_{v \in C} V(R_v)$.

Suppose that G has such a representation. Then the connected components of $G - C$ are interval graphs and each connected component can be represented on one of the paths $P_{(b,l_i]}$; see Fig. 2a and 2c. However, some pairs of connected components of $G - C$ cannot be placed on the same path $P_{(b,l_i]}$ since their "neighborhoods" in C aren't "compatible". The goal is to define a partial ordering $\triangleright$ on the components of $G - C$ such that $H \triangleright H'$ if and only if the induced interval subgraph $G[C, V(H), V(H')]$ has a representation with C being the leftmost maximal clique; see Fig. 2b. Then for a linear chain $H_1, \ldots, H_k$ in $\triangleright$, the induced interval subgraph $G[C, V(H_1), \ldots, V(H_k)]$ can be represented on some path $P_{(b,l_i]}$ (see Lemma 5).

To define $\triangleright$, suppose that we want to find a representation of the induced interval subgraph $G[C, V(H), V(H')]$ such that C is the leftmost maximal clique in this representation. We define $N_C(H) = \{x \in C : xu \in E(G) \text{ for some } u \in V(H)\}$ to be *the set of neighbors of H in C*. Clearly, the necessary condition for H to be placed closer to C, is that every vertex $x \in N_C(H')$ is adjacent to every vertex of H. Using this condition, we define a relation R on the components of $G - C$:

$$(H, H') \in R \iff \forall x \in N_C(H'), \forall v \in V(H) \colon xv \in E(G). \tag{1}$$

The relation R is not necessarily a partial ordering. For example, let H and H' be two components such that $N_C(H) = N_C(H')$ and for every $v \in V(H)$ and $u \in V(H')$, we have $N_C(v) = N_C(H) = N_C(H') = N_C(u)$. Then $(H, H') \in R$ and also $(H', H) \in R$. Such components are *equivalent with respect to C* and we write $H \sim H'$. Clearly, the relation $\sim$ is an equivalence relation. We factorize the set of all connected components of $G - C$ by $\sim$ and obtain a set of non-equivalent connected components of $G - C$, denoted by $\mathcal{H}$. Now we use the condition (1) to define a partial ordering $\triangleright$ on $\mathcal{H}$. A proof of the following lemma is given in Appendix B.

▶ **Lemma 4.** *The relation $\triangleright$ is a strict partial ordering on $\mathcal{H}$.*

The set $\mathcal{H}$ contains a representative from every equivalence class of $\sim$. Let $[H], [H']$ be two equivalence classes of $\sim$ such that $H \triangleright H'$. Suppose that $[H] = \{H_1, \ldots, H_k\}$ and $[H'] = \{H'_1, \ldots, H'_\ell\}$. Then there exists an interval representation of the induced subgraph $G[C, V(H_1), \ldots, V(H_k), V(H'_1), \ldots, V(H'_\ell)]$ such that C is the leftmost maximal clique. Therefore, in the rest of this section we assume that the connected components $\mathcal{H}$ of $G - C$ are non-equivalent with respect to C. The next lemma shows in what conditions we can place some connected components in $\mathcal{H}$ on one path $P_{(b,l_i]}$. For a proof see Appendix B.

▶ **Lemma 5.** *Let $H_1, \ldots, H_k \in \mathcal{H}$. Then the graph $G[C, V(H_1), \ldots, V(H_k)]$ can be represented on a path $P_{(b,l_i]}$ if and only if $H_1, \ldots, H_k$ form a chain in $\triangleright$ and each $G[C, H_i]$ has an interval representation with C being the leftmost clique.*



Figure 2 (a) An example of an S_d-graph G. There is a representation of G with the branching point b in the maximal clique $C = \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$. (b) The partial ordering $\triangleright$ on the connected components of $G - C$. The sets $\{H_1, H_2\}$, $\{H_3, H_4, H_5\}$, and $\{H_6\}$ form a chain cover of $\triangleright$. (c) The connected components are represented on the paths $P_{(b,l_1]}$, $P_{(b,l_2]}$, and $P_{(b,l_3]}$, according to the chain cover of $\triangleright$. (d) The representations R_1, R_2, R_3, R_4 of the vertices of the maximal clique C.

For a given graph G and a maximal clique C of G, the following theorem gives a necessary and a sufficient condition for G to be an S_d-graph having a representation such that C is placed in the branching point of a subdivision of S_d. For a proof see Appendix B.

▶ **Theorem 6.** *Let C be a maximal clique of G, and let $\mathcal{H}$ be the set of connected components of $G - C$ that are non-equivalent with respect to C. Then G has an S_d-representation with $b \in \bigcap_{v \in C} V(R_v)$ if and only if the following hold: (i) For every $H \in \mathcal{H}$, the induced subgraph $G[C, H]$ has an interval representation with C being the leftmost clique. (ii) The partial order $\triangleright$ on $\mathcal{H}$ has a chain cover of size at most d.*

Combining Lemma 5 and Theorem 6 we obtain an algorithm for recognizing S_d-graphs. For a given graph G and its maximal clique C, we do the following: (1) construct the partial ordering $\triangleright$ on the set of non-equivalent connected components $\mathcal{H}$, (2) test whether $\triangleright$ can be covered by at most d chains, (3) for each chain $H_1, \ldots, H_k$ construct an interval representation of $G[C, V(H_1), \ldots, V(H_k)]$ with C being the leftmost maximal clique on one of the paths $P_{(b,l_i]}$. A more detailed description is given as Algorithm 1 in Appendix B.

▶ **Theorem 7.** *Recognition of S_d-graphs can be solved in $\mathcal{O}(n^4)$ time.*

Proof. Every chordal graph has at most n maximal cliques, where n is the number of vertices, and they can be found in linear time [16]. For every clique, our algorithm tries to find an S_d-representation with this clique placed on the central branching point. The construction of such representation takes $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$ steps since interval graph recognition can be done in linear time and minimum clique-cover can be found in $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$ time for comparability graphs [12]. Therefore, the overall time complexity is $\mathcal{O}(n^4)$. ◀

Recognition of T-graphs. Here, we give an XP-time algorithm for the recognition of T-graphs. Recall that, when T is part of the input, deciding if G is a T-graph is NP-complete [14]. Let $\mathcal{B}$ be the set of branching points of T' and let $\mathcal{C}$ be the set of maximal cliques of G. The algorithm for recognizing T-graphs is a generalization of the algorithm for recognizing S_d-graphs, described above. For every mapping $f \colon \mathcal{B} \to \mathcal{C}$, we try to construct a representation $\mathcal{R}$ such that $b \in \bigcap_{v \in f(b)} V(R_v)$, for every $b \in \mathcal{B}$. We show how to find a placement of the connected components of $G - \bigcup_{b \in \mathcal{B}} f(b)$ satisfying (i) and (ii) (if it exists).

Note that if $f(b) = f(b')$, then for every branching point b'' which lies on the path from b to b', we must have $f(b) = f(b'') = f(b')$. Therefore, for $C \in f(\mathcal{B})$, the branching points in $f^{-1}(C)$, together with the paths connecting them, have to form a subtree of T'. Similarly, if G is disconnected, the branching points corresponding to maximal cliques belonging to one connected component of G, together with the paths connecting them, form a subtree of T.

Suppose that G has such a representation. Clearly, the connected components of $G - \bigcup_{b\in\mathcal{B}} f(b)$, are interval graphs. As in the previous section, we use relationships between their sets of neighbors in the maximal cliques to find a valid placement of those components on the paths between the branching points and paths between a branching point and a leaf. The first step of our algorithm is to find the components which have to be represented on a path $P_{(b_i,b_j)}$ between two branching points. The following lemma deals with this problem.

▶ **Lemma 8.** *Let H be a connected component of $G-\bigcup_{b\in\mathcal{B}} f(b)$. Let $b, b \in \mathcal{B}$ and let $C = f(b)$ and $C' = f(b')$. Suppose that the sets $(C \setminus C') \cap N_C(H)$ and $(C' \setminus C) \cap N_{C'}(H)$ are nonempty. Then H has to be represented on the path $P_{(b,b')}$.*

Proof. Let $v \in (C \setminus C') \cap N_C(H)$ and $v' \in (C' \setminus C) \cap N_{C'}(H)$. Since $v \notin C'$, the subtree R_v cannot pass through b'. Similarly $R_{v'}$ cannot pass through b. Therefore, the only possible path where H can be represented is $P_{(b,b')}$. ◀

Let $H_{b,b'}$ be the disjoint union of the components satisfying the conditions of Lemma 8. If induced interval subgraph $G[C, V(H_{b,b'}), C']$ has a representation such that the cliques C and C' are the leftmost and the rightmost, respectively, then we can represent $H_{b,b'}$ in the middle of the path $P_{(b,b')}$. If no such representation exists, then G cannot be represented on T' for this particular $f\colon \mathcal{B} \to \mathcal{C}$. This means that there exist vertices x, y of the path $P_{(b,b')}$ such that the representation of $H_{b,b'}$ is on the subpath $P_{x,y}$. We now remove the subpath $P_{(x,y)}$. We do this for each pair $b, b' \in V(T')$ where b and b' are neighboring branching points.

Let $G' = G - \{H_{b,b'} : bb' \in E(T')\}$. Suppose that $b \in \mathcal{B}$. Let $l_1, \ldots, l_p$ be the leaves of T' and $b_1, \ldots, b_q$ the branching points of T' that are *adjacent* to b, i.e., connected to b by a path which does not pass through another branching point. Let $x_1, y_1, \ldots, x_q, y_q$ be the points of the paths $P_{[b,b_1]}, \ldots, P_{[b,b_q]}$, respectively, such that H_{b,b_i} is represented on the subpath P_{x_i,y_i}. Then the subdivided star S^b, corresponding to the branching point b, consists of the paths $P_{[b,l_1]}, \ldots, P_{[b,l_p]}, P_{[b,b_1]}, \ldots, P_{[b,b_q]}$. Therefore, it remains to find a representation of the graph G' on disjoint subdivided stars.

Moreover, the representation of the induced subgraph $G[f(b), V(H_{b,b_i}), f(b_i)]$ imposes restrictions on the path $P_{(b,x_i)}$. Suppose that a vertex $v \in f(b)$ is adjacent to a vertex from H_{b,b_i}. Then if we want the represent a connected component H of $G' - \bigcup_{b\in\mathcal{B}} f(b)$ on the path $P_{(b,x_i)}$, we can do this only if every vertex of H is adjacent to v.

Disjoint Stars With Restrictions. We have reduced the problem of recognizing T-graphs to the following problem. On the input we have a graph G, k disjoint subdivided stars $S^{b_1}, \ldots, S^{b_k}$ with branching points $b_1, \ldots, b_k$, respectively, a mapping $f\colon \{b_1, \ldots, b_k\} \to \mathcal{C}$, and for every path from b_i to a leaf in S^{b_i} a subset of $f(b_i)$ called, *a subset of restrictions*. We want to find a representation of G on $S^{b_1}, \ldots, S^{b_k}$ such that $b_i \in \bigcap_{v\in f(b_i)} V(R_v)$, and for every connected component H of $G - \bigcup f(b_i)$, the vertices $V(H)$ have to be adjacent to every vertex in the subset of restrictions corresponding to the path on which H is represented.

To solve this problem, we proceed similarly as in the recognition of S_d-graphs. We define a partial ordering on the connected components of $G - C$, where $C = \bigcup f(b_i)$. The neighborhood $N_C(H)$ of H in C, the relation R on the connected components of $G - C$, and the equivalence relation $\sim$ are defined in the same way as in the algorithm for recognizing S_d-graphs. We get a partial ordering $\triangleright$ on the set of non-equivalent connected components

$\mathcal{H}$ of $G - C$. Moreover, to each component $H \in \mathcal{H}$, we assign a list of colors $L(H)$ which correspond to the subpaths from a branching point to a leaf in the stars $S^{b_1}, \ldots, S^{b_k}$, on which they can be represented. Each list $L(H)$ has therefore size at most $d = \sum d_i$, where d_i is the degree of b_i.

Suppose that there exists a chain cover of $\triangleright$ of size d such that for every chain $H_1, \ldots, H_\ell$ in this cover we can pick a color belonging to every $L(H_j)$ such that no two chains get the same color. In that case a representation of G satisfying the restrictions can be constructed analogously as in the proof of Theorem 6.

The partial ordering $\triangleright$ on the components $\mathcal{H}$ defines a comparability graph P with a list of colors $L(v)$ assigned to every vertex $v \in V(P)$. If we find the *list coloring* c of its complement $\overline{P}$, i.e., a coloring that for every vertex v uses only colors from its list $L(v)$, then the vertices of the same color in $\overline{P}$ correspond to a chain (clique) in P. Therefore, we have reduced our problem to list coloring co-comparability graphs with lists of bounded size.

Bounded List Coloring of Co-comparability Graphs. We showed that to solve the problem of recognizing T-graphs it suffices to to solve the ℓ-list coloring problem for co-comparability graphs where $\ell = 2 \cdot |E(T)|$. In particular, given a co-comparability graph G, a set of colors S such that $|S| \leq \ell$, and a set $L(v) \subseteq S$ for each vertex v, we want to find a proper coloring $c\colon V(G) \to S$ such that for every vertex v, we have $c(v) \in L(v)$.

In [2] the *capacitated coloring problem* is solved on co-comparability graphs. Namely, given a graph G, an integer $s \geq 1$ of colors, and positive integers $\alpha_1^*, \ldots, \alpha_s^*$, a *capacitated s-coloring φ of G* is a proper s-coloring such that the number of vertices assigned color i is bounded by α_i^*, i.e., $|\varphi^{-1}(i)| \leq \alpha_i^*$. They prove that the capacitated coloring of co-comparability graphs can be solved in polynomial time for fixed s.

In appendix E we modify [2] to solve the s-list coloring problem on co-comparability graphs in $\mathcal{O}(n^{s^2+1}s^3)$ time. This provides the following theorem.

▶ **Theorem 9.** *Recognition of T-graphs can be solved in $n^{\mathcal{O}(\|T\|^2)}$.*

3 Recognition Hardness

In this section we answer Problem 6.3 of Biro, Hujter, and Tuza [1] in the negative. They asked whether H-GRAPH can be recognized in polynomial time for every fixed H, and we show that the recognition problem is NP-complete for the class H-GRAPH when H is a *diamond*, i.e., a *diamond* (D) is the 4-vertex graph obtained by deleting a single edge from a 4-clique. This result is particularly surprising as it shows a sharp contrast to the fact that the recognition of circular arc graphs (i.e., H-GRAPH when H is a cycle) can be performed in polynomial time, i.e., adding a single "edge" to a cycle results in recognition going from polynomial-time solvable to NP-hard.

Our hardness proof stems from the NP-hardness of testing whether a partial order (poset) with *height* one has *interval dimension* at most three (H1ID3) – shown by Yannakakis [17]. The *height* of a partial order $\mathcal{P} = (P, <)$ is the length of the longest chain in P (number of edges in the directed acyclic graph). In particular, having height one means that every element is either a minima or maxima of $\mathcal{P}$. Consider a collection $\mathcal{I}$ of closed intervals on the real line. A poset $\mathcal{P}_\mathcal{I} = (\mathcal{I}, <)$ can be defined on $\mathcal{I}$, by considering intervals $x, y \in \mathcal{I}$ and setting $x < y$ if and only if the right endpoint of x is strictly to the left of the left endpoint of y. A partial order $\mathcal{P}$ is called an *interval order* when there is an $\mathcal{I}$ such that $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}_\mathcal{I}$. Moreover, the *interval dimension* of a poset $\mathcal{P} = (P, <)$, is the minimum number of interval orders whose intersection is $\mathcal{P}$, i.e., for elements $x, y \in P$, $x < y$ if and only if x is before y in all of the interval orders. Finally, the *incomparability graph* $G_\mathcal{P}$ of a poset $\mathcal{P} = (P, <)$ is

the graph with $V(G) = P$ and uv is an edge if and only if u and v are not comparable in $\mathcal{P}$. Notice that, when $\mathcal{P}$ has height one, the vertex set of $G_{\mathcal{P}}$ is *co-bipartite*, i.e., it naturally partitions into two cliques, one $K_{\max}$ on the maxima of $\mathcal{P}$ and one $K_{\min}$ on the minima of $\mathcal{P}$. With these definitions in place we now prove the theorem of this section.

▶ **Theorem 10.** *For a given co-bipartite graph G, it is* NP*-complete to test whether G is a topological intersection graph of a diamond, i.e., to test whether $G \in D$-GRAPH.*

Proof. We first summarize the idea behind our proof. As stated above we will encode an instance $\mathcal{P}$ of H1ID3 as an instance of membership testing in D-GRAPH. For a given height one poset $\mathcal{P}$, we construct its incomparability graph $G_{\mathcal{P}}$, slightly augment $G_{\mathcal{P}}$ to a graph G and show that G is in D-GRAPH if and only if the interval dimension of P is at most three. In particular, the three paths connecting the two degree three vertices in D will encode the three interval orders whose intersection is $\mathcal{P}$.

To obtain our reduction we first consider H-representations of the graph T_3 where T_3 is obtained by subdividing every edge of the star S_3 exactly once. This tree is interesting because it is neither an interval graph nor a circular arc graph. In particular, any topological intersection representation of it must contain a node of degree three.

Consider a height one poset $\mathcal{P} = (P, <)$, the graph $G_{\mathcal{P}}$, and let $K_{\max}$ and $K_{\min}$ be the two cliques in $G_{\mathcal{P}}$ on the maxima and minima of $\mathcal{P}$ respectively. We now construct the graph G. We start with two copies $T_{\max}$ and $T_{\min}$ of T_3. The graph G is obtained by taking the disjoint union of the graphs $T_{\max}$, $T_{\min}$, and $G_{\mathcal{P}}$ and then making every vertex of $T_{\max}$ adjacent to every vertex of $K_{\max}$, and every vertex of $T_{\min}$ adjacent to every vertex of $K_{\min}$. We claim that $\mathcal{P}$ has interval dimension at most three if and only if G is in D-GRAPH.

For the reverse direction, we consider a D^*-representation $\{D^*_v : v \in V(G), D^*_v \subseteq V(D^*)\}$ of G where D^* is a subdivision of D. The consequence of the observation regarding the T_3's is that in D^*, one degree three node is contained in the representation of $T_{\min}$ and the other degree three node is contained in the representation of $T_{\max}$. We refer to the former degree three node of D^* as $u_{\min}$ and the latter as $u_{\max}$. Since each maxima y of $\mathcal{P}$ is not adjacent to any vertex of $T_{\min}$, D^*_y cannot contain $u_{\min}$. Thus, for each maxima y, D^*_y is a subtree of the tree $D^* \setminus \{u_{\min}\}$. In particular, D^*_y defines one (possibly empty) subpath/interval (originating in $u_{\max}$) in each of the three paths connecting $u_{\max}$ and $u_{\min}$. Similarly, for each minima x, D^*_x defines one (possibly empty) subpath/interval (originating in $u_{\min}$) in each of the three paths connecting $u_{\max}$ and $u_{\min}$. It is easy to see that this collection of intervals provides the needed three interval orders whose intersection is $\mathcal{P}$.

For the forward direction, we consider the three sets of intervals $\mathcal{I}_1$, $\mathcal{I}_2$, $\mathcal{I}_3$ where each interval in $\mathcal{I}_i$ is labelled according to its corresponding element of $\mathcal{P}$, and $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_1} \cap \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_2} \cap \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_3}$, i.e., certifying that $\mathcal{P}$ has interval dimension at most three. Without loss of generality we may assume that the intervals of the minima all have their left endpoints at 0 and their right endpoints as integers in the range $[0, n-1]$. Similarly, the intervals of the maxima all have their right endpoints at n and their left endpoints as integers in the range $[1, n]$. With this in mind, for each minimal element x we use x_i to denote the right endpoint of its interval in $\mathcal{I}_i$ $(i = 1, 2, 3)$ and for each maximal element y, we use y_i to denote the left endpoint of its interval in $\mathcal{I}_i$.

We subdivide the diamond D so that each path between the degree three vertices contains $n + 5$ nodes and call this new graph D^*. We then label the nodes of D^* as follows. The two degree three nodes are labelled $u_{\min}$ and $u_{\max}$, and we label the three $(u_{\min}, u_{\max})$-paths as:

- $u_{\min}, \alpha_{\min}, \alpha'_{\min}, \alpha_0, \alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n, \alpha'_{\max}, \alpha_{\max}, u_{\max}$;
- $u_{\min}, \beta_{\min}, \beta'_{\min}, \beta_0, \beta_1, \ldots, \beta_n, \beta'_{\max}, \beta_{\max}, u_{\max}$; and

- $u_{\min}, \gamma'_{\min}, \gamma_{\min}, \gamma_0, \gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_n, \gamma'_{\max}, \gamma_{\max}, u_{\max}$.

It remains to describe the D^*-representation of G. Each minimal element x is represented by the minimal subtree of D^* which includes the nodes $u_{\min}, \alpha_{x_1}, \beta_{x_2}, \gamma_{x_3}$. Similarly, each maximal element y is represented by the minimal subtree of D^* which includes the nodes $u_{\max}, \alpha_{y_1}, \beta_{y_2}, \gamma_{y_3}$. At this point we can see that the comparable elements of $\mathcal{P}$ will be represented by disjoint subgraphs of D^* and the incomparable elements will intersect.

For the vertices of $T_{\min}$ (the vertices of $T_{\max}$ are represented analogously):

- the degree three vertex is represented by the subtree induced by $u_{\min}$,$\alpha'_{\min}$, $\beta'_{\min}$, $\gamma'_{\min}$;
- the three degree two vertices a, b, and c are respectively represented by the three edges $\alpha'_{\min}\alpha_{\min}$, $\beta'_{\min}\beta_{\min}$, and $\gamma'_{\min}\gamma_{\min}$; and
- the degree one neighbor of a is represented by the node $\alpha'_{\min}$, the degree one neighbor of b is represented by the node $\beta'_{\min}$, and the degree one neighbor of c is represented by the node $\gamma'_{\min}$.

From this construction, we can see that the graphs $T_{\min}$ and $T_{\max}$ are correctly represented. Moreover, the subtree of each of the minima includes all of $u_{\min}, \alpha_{\min}, \alpha'_{\min}, \beta_{\min}, \beta'_{\min}, \gamma_{\min}, \gamma'_{\min}$, but none of the corresponding max elements. Thus, each minima is universal to $T_{\min}$ and non-adjacent to the vertices of $T_{\max}$ as needed. Symmetrically, each maxima is universal to $T_{\max}$ and non-adjacent to the vertices of $T_{\min}$. Thus, G is in D-GRAPH. ◀

We conclude this section by conjecturing that our reduction can be generalized to larger graphs H. In particular, we expect that for any graph H which contains a diamond as a minor, the recognition problem will be similarly NP-complete for H-GRAPH.

4 Dominating Set

In this section, we discuss the minimum dominating set problem on H-GRAPH. This section is divided into two parts. In the first part we solve the minimum dominating set problem on S_d-GRAPH in FPT-time parameterized by d. In the second part we consider H-GRAPH (for general H), and solve the problem in XP-time parameterized by $\|H\| = |V(H)| + |E(H)|$. Based on the latter result, we also obtain XP-time algorithms for maximum independent set and independent dominating set on H-GRAPH (these are also parameterized by $\|H\|$).

We first recall a useful result regarding finding specialized dominating sets in interval graphs (see Lemma 11). Namely, it states that, in linear time, one can produce the minimum dominating set of an interval graph which contains certain prescribed vertices. For a proof see Appendix D.

▶ **Lemma 11.** *Let $G = (V, E)$ be an interval graph and let $C_1, \ldots, C_k$ be the left-to-right ordering of the maximal cliques in an interval representation of G. For every $x \in C_1$, a minimum dominating set of G containing x can be found in linear time.*

▶ **Theorem 12.** *For an S_d-graph G, the minimum dominating set of G can be found in $\mathcal{O}((d \cdot (2^{d^2} + n \cdot (n + m)))$.*

Proof. Let G be an S_d-graph and let S be a subdivision of the star S_d such that G has S-representation. Let b be the central branching vertex of S and let $b_1, \ldots, b_d$ be the leaves of S. Recall that, by Lemma 3, a given S-representation can be transformed (in linear time) into another S-representation $\mathcal{R} = \{R_v : v \in V(G)\}$ where $b \in \bigcap\{R_v : v \in C\}$, for some maximal clique C of G. Let $C_{i,1}, \ldots, C_{i,k_i}$ be the maximal cliques of G as they appear on the branch $P_{(b,b_i]}$, for $i = 1, \ldots, d$.

For every $G_i = G[C, C_{i,1}, \ldots, C_{i,k_i}]$, we use the standard interval graph greedy algorithm [11] to find the size d_i of a minimum dominating set in G_i. Let B_i be the set of vertices of C that can appear in a minimum dominating set of G_i. By Lemma 11, a minimum dominating set D_i^x containing a vertex $x \in C$ can be found in linear time. We have $x \in B_i$ if and only if $|D_i^x| = d_i$. Therefore, every $B_1, \ldots, B_d$ can be found in $\mathcal{O}(d \cdot n \cdot (n+m))$ time. Let $\mathcal{B} = \{B_1, \ldots, B_d\}$.

If B_i is empty, then no minimum dominating set of G_i contains a vertex from C. For G_i, we can choose an arbitrary dominating set D_i and this choice is optimal. If every B_i is empty, then the minimum dominating set of G is the union $D_1 \cup \cdots \cup D_d \cup \{x\}$, for an arbitrary $x \in C$.

Let us assume now that the B_i's are nonempty (every branch with an empty B_i can be simply ignored). Let H be a subset of C such that $H \cap B_i$ is not empty, for every $i = 1, \ldots, d$, and $|H|$ is smallest possible. For every branch $P_{(b,b_i]}$, we pick a minimum dominating set D_i of G_i containing an arbitrary vertex $x_i \in H \cap B_i$. The minimum dominating set of G is then the union $D_1 \cup \cdots \cup D_d$. It remains to prove that we can find the set H in time that only depends on the parameter d.

For every $x \in C$, there are at most 2^d possibilities to which sets from $\mathcal{B}$ it can belong. Note that, when two vertices in C have the same membership in the sets $\mathcal{B}$, one such vertex is redundant, i.e., after discarding all such redundant vertices at most 2^d *useful* vertices remain in C. Let A be this set of useful vertices. Clearly, A can be found in $O(d \cdot |C|)$-time. Finally, we note that it suffices to take at most d vertices from A to cover $\mathcal{B}$, so we simply try all subsets of size up to d of A. The number of such subsets is $\mathcal{O}(d \cdot \binom{2^d}{d})$.

This gives us a total running time of $\mathcal{O}((d \cdot (2^{d^2} + n \cdot (n+m)))$. ◀

H-GRAPH. We now consider the H-GRAPH for general H. Here we will solve the problem in XP-time parameterized by $\|H\|$. Recall that, when H is a cycle, H-GRAPH = CARC, i.e., minimum dominating sets can be found efficiently [5]. Thus, we assume H is not a cycle.

To introduce our main idea, we need some notation. Consider $G \in H$-GRAPH and let H' be a subdivision of H such that G has an H'-representation $\{H'_v : v \in V(G)\}$. We distinguish two important types of nodes in H'; namely, $x \in V(H')$ is called *high degree* when it has at least three neighbors and x is *low degree* otherwise. As usual, the high degree nodes play a key role. In particular, if we know the sub-solution which *dominates* the high degree nodes of H', then the remaining part of the solution must be strictly contained in the low degree part of H'. Moreover, since H is not a cycle, the subgraph $H'_{\leq 2}$ of H' induced by its low degree nodes is a collection of paths. In particular, the vertices v of G where H'_v only contains low degree nodes, induce an interval graph $G_{\leq 2}$ and, as such, we can efficiently find minimum dominating sets on them. Thus, the general idea here is to first enumerate the possible sub-solutions on the high degree nodes, then efficiently (and optimally) extend each sub-solution to a complete solution. In particular, one can show that in any minimum dominating set these sub-solutions consist of at most $2 \cdot |E(H)|$ vertices, and from this observation it is not difficult to produce the claimed $n^{\mathcal{O}(\|H\|)}$-time algorithm. Thus, we have the following theorem whose full proof is given in Appendix D.

▶ **Theorem 13.** *For an H-graph G a minimum dominating set can be found in $n^{O(\|H\|)}$.*

As a final remark, we note that the above approach can also be applied to solve the maximum independent set and independent dominating set problems in $n^{O(\|H\|)}$ time. This approach is successful since these problem can be solved efficiently on interval graphs. It remains open whether one can improve these XP-time algorithms to FPT-time.

▶ **Corollary 14.** *For an H-graph G a maximum independent set can be found in $n^{O(\|H\|)}$.*

▶ **Corollary 15.** *For an H-graph G an independent dominating set can be found in $n^{O(\|H\|)}$.*

References

1 Miklós Biro, Mihály Hujter, and Zs Tuza. Precoloring extension. i. interval graphs. *Discrete Mathematics*, 100(1):267–279, 1992.

2 Flavia Bonomo, Sara Mattia, and Gianpaolo Oriolo. Bounded coloring of co-comparability graphs and the pickup and delivery tour combination problem. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 412(45):6261–6268, 2011.

3 K. S. Booth and G. S. Lueker. Testing for the consecutive ones property, interval graphs, and planarity using PQ-tree algorithms. *J. Comput. System Sci.*, 13:335–379, 1976.

4 Kellogg S Booth and J Howard Johnson. Dominating sets in chordal graphs. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 11(1):191–199, 1982.

5 Maw-Shang Chang. Efficient algorithms for the domination problems on interval and circular-arc graphs. *SIAM Journal on computing*, 27(6):1671–1694, 1998.

6 Steven Chaplick and Juraj Stacho. The vertex leafage of chordal graphs. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 168:14–25, 2014.

7 Marek Cygan, Fedor V Fomin, Łukasz Kowalik, Daniel Lokshtanov, Dániel Marx, Marcin Pilipczuk, Michał Pilipczuk, and Saket Saurabh. *Parameterized Algorithms*, volume 4. Springer, 2015.

8 D. R. Fulkerson and O. A. Gross. Incidence matrices and interval graphs. *Pac. J. Math.*, 15:835–855, 1965.

9 F. Gavril. The intersection graphs of subtrees in trees are exactly the chordal graphs. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 16(1):47–56, 1974.

10 Fănică Gavril. Intersection graphs of Helly families of subtrees. *Discrete Appl. Math.*, 66(1):45–56, 1996.

11 M. C. Golumbic. *Algorithmic graph theory and perfect graphs*, volume 57. Elsevier, 2004.

12 Martin Charles Golumbic. The complexity of comparability graph recognition and coloring. *Computing*, 18(3):199–208, 1977.

13 Michel Habib and Juraj Stacho. Reduced clique graphs of chordal graphs. *European Journal of Combinatorics*, 33(5):712–735, 2012.

14 P. Klavík, J. Kratochvíl, Y. Otachi, and T. Saitoh. Extending partial representations of subclasses of chordal graphs. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 576:85–101, 2015.

15 G. S. Lueker and K. S. Booth. A linear time algorithm for deciding interval graph isomorphism. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 26(2):183–195, 1979.

16 Donald J Rose, R Endre Tarjan, and George S Lueker. Algorithmic aspects of vertex elimination on graphs. *SIAM Journal on computing*, 5(2):266–283, 1976.

17 Mihalis Yannakakis. The complexity of the partial order dimension problem. *SIAM Journal on Algebraic Discrete Methods*, 3(3):351–358, 1982.

A Comments for the appendix

Note that references made in this appendix will appear at the end of the document.

B Recognition

Proof of Lemma 3. Let V_b be the set of vertices corresponding to the subtrees passing through b, i.e., $V_b = \{u \in V(G) : b \in V(R_u)\}$. If V_b is a maximal clique, we are done.

Suppose that V_b is not a maximal clique. Let C be a maximal clique of G such that $V_b \subseteq C$ and the distance between b and the set $R_C = \bigcap\{V(R_v) : v \in C\}$ is minimal. Notice that R_C is non-empty since the collection $\mathcal{R}$ satisfies the Helly property. Let $a \in R_C$ be the vertex closest to b. Since the distance between b and R_C is minimal, no vertex of the path $P_{[b,a]}$ is contained in $R_{C'}$, for some other maximal clique C'. Therefore, we can define $R'_v = R_v \cup P_{[b,a]}$, for $v \in C \setminus V_b$, and $R'_v = R_v$, for $v \in V_b$, thus obtaining a correct representation $\mathcal{R}' = \{R'_v : v \in V(G)\}$ of G with $b \in \bigcap_{v \in C} V(R'_v)$.

We repeat this process until there exists a branching point that is not contained in a maximal clique. ◀

Proof of Lemma 4. Suppose that $H \triangleright H'$ and $H' \triangleright H$. Then for every $x \in N_C(H')$ and $v \in V(H)$ we have $x \in N_C(v)$. Therefore, $N_C(H') \subseteq N_C(v) \subseteq N_C(H)$. Similarly, for every $y \in N_C(H)$ and $u \in V(H')$ we have $N_C(H) \subseteq N_C(u) \subseteq N_C(H')$. We get that $N_C(H) = N_C(H')$ and also that $N_C(v) = N_C(H)$ and $N_C(u) = N_C(H')$. Thus, $H = H'$ and $\triangleright$ is antisymmetric. Clearly, $H \triangleright H'$ and $H' \triangleright H''$ implies $H \triangleright H''$, so $\triangleright$ is also transitive. ◀

Proof of Lemma 5. Since H_i are connected components of $G - C$, their representations have to be placed on non-overlapping parts of $P_{(b,l_i]}$. Suppose that we have a representation of the induces subgraph $G[C, V(H_1), \ldots, V(H_k)]$ on $P_{(b,l_i]}$. Assume that the components $H_1, \ldots, H_k$ are ordered such that $i < j$ if and only if H_i is closer to b than H_j. For vertex in $v \in N_C(H_i)$, the representation of v has to overlap at least a part of the representation of H_i, and therefore, it is adjacent to all vertices in H_j, for all $j < i$. Therefore, the components $H_1, \ldots, H_k$ form a chain in $\triangleright$. Clearly, every $G[C, H_i]$ has an interval representation with C being the leftmost clique.

For the converse, assume that $H_1, \ldots, H_k$ form a chain in $\triangleright$ and every $G[C, H_i]$ has an interval representation with C being the leftmost clique. Since $H_j \triangleright H_i$, for $j < i$, all vertices in $N_C(H_i)$ are adjacent to every vertex in H_j. To obtain a representation of $G[C, V(H_1), \ldots, V(H_k)]$, we first place the representations of all H_i on $P_{(b,l_i]}$ according to $\triangleright$, with H_1 being closest to b. All $G[C, V(H_i)]$ have an interval representation. We first place the representations of the vertices in $N_C(H_k)$. From the definition of $\triangleright$, we have that all those vertices are adjacent to all vertices in $H_1, \ldots, H_{k-1}$. For $i = k-1, \ldots, 1$, we place the representations of the vertices in $N_C(H_i) \setminus N_C(H_{i+1}) \cup \cdots \cup N_C(H_k)$. Again, from the definition of $\triangleright$, we have that those vertices are adjacent to all vertices in $H_1, \ldots, H_{i-1}$. This defines a correct representation of $G[C, V(H_1), \ldots, V(H_k)]$. ◀

Proof of Theorem 6. Suppose that G is an S_d-graph such that $b \in \bigcap\{T_v : v \in C\}$. The representation of a connected component $H \in \mathcal{H}$ can not pass through the branching point b since otherwise C would not be a maximal clique. Clearly, the condition (i) is satisfied. Moreover, the representations of every two components in $\mathcal{H}$ have to be placed on non-overlapping parts of S_d. By Lemma 5 we have that the components placed on some branch of S_d form a chain in $\triangleright$. Therefore, the partial order $\triangleright$ has a chain cover of size d and the condition (ii) is satisfied; see Fig. 2b.

For the converse, suppose that the conditions (i) and (ii) are satisfied. We place the components in $\mathcal{H}$ on the $P_{(b,l_1]}, \ldots, P_{(b,l_d]}$ according to the chain cover of $\triangleright$ which has size d. By Lemma 5, for every chain $H_1, \ldots, H_k$ in $\triangleright$, we can find an interval representation of the graph $G[C, V(H_1), \ldots, V(H_k)]$. We combine the representations of the d chains. Further, the connected components that are equivalent with respect to C, i.e., belong to the same equivalence class in $\sim$, can be easily placed next to its representative. Thus, we obtain an representation of G. ◀

Algorithm 1: RECOGNITION(S_d-GRAPH)

Require: A graph G and a tree T.
Ensure: An intersection representation of G on a subdivision of T if it exists.

1: Find all maximal cliques $\mathcal{C}$ of G.
2: If G is an S_d-graph, then by Lemma 3 there exists a representation $\mathcal{R}$ of G with $b \in \bigcap\{R_v : v \in C\}$, for some $C \in \mathcal{C}$.
3: **for** a maximal clique $C \in \mathcal{C}$ **do**
4: Try to find a representation with C in the branching point:
5: Find the equivalence classes of $\sim$ and pick a representative for each equivalence class. Let $\mathcal{H}$ be the set of these representatives.
6: **for** a connected component $H \in \mathcal{H}$ **do**
7: Find an interval representation of $G[C, H]$.
8: If there is a chain cover of $\triangleright$ of size at most d, then construct a representation as described in the proof of Theorem 6.

C Finding a Minimum Dominating Set in Interval Graphs

Suppose that we have an interval representation of a graph G and let $C_1, \ldots, C_k$ be the left-to-right ordering of the maximal cliques. For every vertex $v \in C_1$ there exists ℓ such that $v \in C_\ell$, but $v \notin C_{\ell+1}$ We pick the vertex $v \in C_1$ such that ℓ is maximal. We add v to the dominating set and continue smilarly for $C_{\ell+1}$; see Algorithm 2.

Algorithm 2: DOMINATINGSET(INT)

Require: An interval representation $\mathcal{R}$ of a graph G.
Ensure: A minimum dominating set of G.

1: $D \leftarrow \emptyset$, $i \leftarrow 1$.
2: Let $C_1, \ldots, C_k$ be the left-to-right ordering of the maximal cliques in $\mathcal{R}$.
3: **while** $i \leq k$ **do**
4: Choose $v \in C_i$ with maximal ℓ such that $v \in C_\ell$, but $v \notin C_{\ell+1}$.
5: $D \leftarrow D \cup \{v\}$, $i \leftarrow \ell + 1$.
6: **return** D

▶ **Lemma 16.** *The described algorithm finds a minimum dominating set of an interval graph.*

Proof. Suppose that at some step of the algorithm we choose $v \in C_i$ with maximal ℓ such that $v \in C_\ell$, but $v \notin C_{\ell+1}$. Let D' be a minimum dominating set for the induced subgraph $G[C_{\ell+1}, \ldots, C_k]$. The set D' does not dominate the maximal clique C_i since then ℓ would not be maximal and this would contradict the choice of v. Therefore, the minimum dominating set of $G[C_i, \ldots, C_k]$ has size at least $|D'| + 1$. It follows that $D' \cup \{v\}$ is a minimum dominating set of $G[C_i, \ldots, C_k]$ with size $|D'| + 1$. We have shown that for an arbitrary minimum dominating set of $G[C_{\ell+1}, \ldots, C_k]$, the vertex v is an optimal choice. ◀

▶ **Lemma 17.** *The problem* DOMINATINGSET(INT) *can be solved in linear time.*

Proof. An interval representation of an interval graph can be found in linear time [2]. The number of maximal cliques in an interval graph is at most n. In the procedure, described in Algorithm 2, every maximal clique in the left-to-right ordering $C_1, \ldots, C_k$ is checked at most constant number of times. ◀

D Dominating Set

Proof of Lemma 11. We construct a new graph $G' = (V', E')$ where $V' = V \cup \{u\}$ and $E' = E \cup \{u, x\}$. Clearly, G' is an interval graph and there is an interval representation with $\{u, x\} = C_0, C_1, \ldots, C_k$ being the left-to-right ordering of the maximamal cliques in this representation. The procedure in Algorithm 2 always picks the vertex $x \in C_0$ and finds a minimum dominating set D of G'. The set D is a minimum dominating set of G containing the vertex x. ◀

Proof of Theorem 13. Here we will show that, for any fixed graph H, on the class H-GRAPH, the dominating set problem can be solved in XP-time parameterized by $\|H\|$.

Recall that, when H is a cycle, H-GRAPH = CARC, i.e., minimum dominating sets can be found efficiently [3]. Thus, we assume H is not a cycle.

To introduce our main idea, we need some notation. Consider $G \in H$-GRAPH and let H' be a subdivision of H such that G has an H'-representation $\{H'_v : v \in V(G)\}$. We distinguish two important types of nodes in H'; namely, $x \in V(H')$ is called *high degree* when it has at least three neighbors and x is *low degree* otherwise. As usual, the high degree nodes play a key role. In particular, if we know the sub-solution which *dominates* the high degree nodes of H', then the remaining part of the solution must be strictly contained in the low degree part of H'. Moreover, since H is not a cycle, the subgraph $H'_{\leq 2}$ of H' induced by its low degree nodes is a collection of paths. In particular, the vertices v of G where H'_v only contains low degree nodes, induce an interval graph $G_{\leq 2}$ and, as such, we can efficiently find minimum dominating sets on them. Thus, the general idea here is to first enumerate the possible sub-solutions on the high degree nodes, then efficiently (and optimally) extend each sub-solution to a complete solution. In particular, one can show that in any minimum dominating set these sub-solutions consist of at most $2 \cdot |E(H)|$ vertices, and from this observation it is not difficult to produce the claimed $n^{\mathcal{O}(\|H\|)}$-time algorithm. Further details are given in

We observe that the size of these sub-solutions is "small". Let $D \subseteq V(G)$ be a minimum dominating set of G. For each node x of H', let $V_x = \{v : v \in V(G), x \in H'_v\}$ and $D_x = \{v : v \in D, x \in H'_v\}$. We further let $D_{\geq 3} = \bigcup\{D_x : \delta_H(x) \geq 3\}$. We now bound the size of $D_{\geq 3}$ in terms of H.

▶ **Lemma 18.** *If D is an MDS in an H-graph G, then $|D_{\geq 3}| \leq 2|E(H)|$.*

Proof. Consider a high degree node x of H. For each edge xx' in H, let $x = x_1, \ldots, x_k = x'$ be the corresponding path in H'. We assign a single vertex a in D to the ordered pair (x, x') such that H'_a contains the longest subpath of $u_1, \ldots, u_k$. Notice that each ordered pair receives precisely one element of D. However, if some element v of $D_{\geq 3}$ was not assigned to an ordered pair, then it is easy to see that D is not a minimum dominating set (since all adjacencies achieved by this element are already achieved by the elements we have charged to ordered pairs). ◀

By Lemma 18, there are at most $n^{2 \cdot |E(H)|}$ possible sets $D_{\geq 3}$. We now fix one such $D_{\geq 3}$ and describe how to compute a minimum dominating set of G containing it. Notice that, there can be some difficult decisions we might need to make in this process. In particular, suppose there is a high degree node x of H' where no vertex from V_x is in $D_{\geq 3}$. It is not clear how we might be able to efficiently choose from "nearby" x to dominate these vertices. To get around this case, we simply enumerate more vertices. Specifically, for each path $P_{x,y} = (x, x_1, \ldots, x_k, y)$ in H' where x and y are high degree nodes (or where x is high degree

and y is a leaf), and the x_i's are low degree, we will pick a "first" and "last" vertex among the vertices v of G where H'_v is contained in the subpath $(v_1, \ldots, v_k)$ of $P_{x,y}$. That is, for a given $D_{\geq 3}$ we enumerate all possible subsets of size $2 \cdot |E(H)|$ from among the vertices of $G_{\leq 2}$ to act as the "first" and "last" vertices of each path $P_{x,y}$. Clearly, there are at most $O(n^{2 \cdot |E(H)|})$ such subsets. We fix one such subsets $D_{\leq 2}$.

We now have our candidate sub-solutions $D^* = D_{\geq 3} \cup D_{\geq 2}$. There are just some simple sanity checks we must make on D^* to test if it is a good candidate to be extended to a dominating set. First, it must already dominate every vertex of $G_{\geq 3}$. Second, if there is some path $P_{x,y}$ where $D_{\leq 2}$ contains fewer than two vertices form $P_{x,y}$, then D^* must already dominate every vertex contained in this path. And finally, for every path $P_{x,y}$, for every v with H'_v contained strictly between x and the "left-end" of the "first" chosen vertex, then v must be dominated by $D_{\geq 3}$. If one of these conditions is violated, we discard this candidate D^* and go to the next one.

Finally, what remains to be dominated consists of a collection of disjoint interval graphs where possibly some sequence of "left-most" and "right-most" maximal cliques have already been dominated by D^*. For each such, partially left and right dominated, interval graph we can optimally determine a minimum dominating set by simply applying the usual greedy algorithm for interval graphs and starting in the "left"-most non-dominated clique.

This completes the description of the algorithm. From the discussion, we can see that the algorithm is correct and that the total running time is dominated by the enumeration of the possible sets D^* plus some additional polynomial factors. In particular, the algorithm runs in $n^{\mathcal{O}(\|H\|)}$ time. ◀

E Bounded List Coloring of Co-comparability Graphs

We show how to solve the problem of bounded list coloring of co-comparability graphs. To do this, we almost exactly follow the approach in [1].

In [1], the problem of capacitated coloring is solved for a more general class of graphs, so called k-thin graphs. A graph G is *k-thin* if there exists an ordering $v_1, \ldots, v_n$ of $V(G)$ and a partition of $V(G)$ into k classes $V^1, \ldots, V^k$ such that, for each triple p, q, r with $p < q < r$, if v_p, v_q belong to the same class and $v_r v_p \in E(G)$, then $v_r v_p \in E(G)$. Such orderng and partition are said to be *consistent* The minimum k such that G is k-thin is called the *thinness* of G. Graphs with bounded thinness were introduced in [5] as a generalization of interval graphs. Note that interval graphs are exactly 1-thin graphs.

Recall that a graph G is a *comparability graph* if there exits an ordreing $v_1, \ldots, v_n$ of $V(G)$ such that, for each triple p, q, r with $p < q < r$, fi $v_p v_q$ and $v_q v_r$ are edges of G, then so is $v_p v_r$. Such an ordering is a *comparability ordering.*

▶ **Theorem 19** (Theorem 8, [1]). *Let G be a co-comparability graph. Then the thinness of G is at most $\chi(G)$, where χ is the chromatic number. Moreover, any vertex partition given by a coloring of G and any comparability ordering for its complement are consistent.*

Let G be k-thin graph, and let $v_1, \ldots, v_n$ and $V^1, \ldots, V^k$ be an ordering and a partition of $V(G)$ which are consistent. Note that the ordering induces an order on each class V^j. For each vertex v_r and class V^j, let $N(v_r, j)_<$ be the set of neighbors of v_r in V^j that are smaller than v_r, i.e., $N(v_r, j)_< = V^j \cap \{v_1, \ldots, v_{r-1}\} \cap N(v_r)$. For each class V^j let $\Delta(j)_<$ be the maximum size of $N(v_r, j)_<$ over all vertices v_r. The following lemma gives an alternative definition of k-thin graphs.

▶ **Lemma 20** (Fact 7, [1]). *For each vertex $v_r \in \{v_1, \ldots, v_n\}$ and each $j \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$, the set $N(v_r, j)_<$ is such that:*

- *the vertices in $N(v_r, j)_<$ are consecutive, with respect to the order induced on V^j.*
- *if $N(v_r, j)_< \neq \emptyset$, the it includes the largest vertex in $V^j \cap \{v_1, \ldots, v_{r-1}\}$.*

Bounded List Coloring On k-thin Graphs. In [1], the problem of capacitated coloring is reduced to a reachability problem on an auxiliary acyclic digraph. We obtain an algorithm for bounded list coloring on k-thin graphs by slightly modifying the algorithm for capacitated coloring in [1]. The only difference is that we do not have a restriction on how many times we can use a particular color and for every vertex we can only use the colors from the list assigned to it. Otherwise, everything is the same as in [1]. We include it here for completeness.

Let G be a k-thin graph with an ordering $v_1, \ldots, v_n$ and a partition $V^1, V^2, \ldots, V^k$ of $V(G)$. Let S be a set of colors, $s = |S|$ and $L : V(G) \to \mathcal{P}(S)$ a function that assigns a list of allowed colors to a vertex. Consider an instance (G, L) of list coloring. We reduce the problem to a reachability problem on an auxiliary acyclic digraph $D(N, A)$. We will refer to the elements of N and A as *nodes* and *arcs* while the elements of $V(G)$ and $E(G)$ will be referred to as *vertices* and *edges* (as we did so far).

The digraph D will be *layered*, i.e., the set N is the disjoint union of subsets (layers) $N_0, N_1, \ldots, N_n$ and all arcs of A have the form (u, w) with $u \in N_r$ and $w \in N_{r+1}$ for some $0 \leq r \leq n-1$. Note that there is a layer $N_r, r \neq 0$, for each vertex $v_r \in V$. We denote by $j(r)$ the class index q such that $v_r \in V^q$.

We first describe the set of nodes in each layer. The first layer consists of colors which can be assigned to the first vertex, i.e., $N_0 = L(v_1)$. As for layers $N_1, \ldots, N_n - 1$, there is a one-to-one correspondence between nodes at layer N_r and $(sk+1)$-tuples $(r, \{\beta\}_{i=1,\ldots,s,j=1,\ldots,k})$ with $0 \leq \beta_i^j \leq \Delta(j)_<$, for each i, j. As for the last layer, it has only one node t corresponding to the tuple $(n, 0, \ldots, 0)$.

We associate with each node $u \notin N_0$ a suitable list coloring problem *with additional constraints*, that we call the *constrained sub-problem* associated with u. As we show in the following, u is reachable from a node $z \in N_0$ if and only if this constrained sub-problem has a solution. Namely, we will show that the following property holds:

(∗) a node $(r, \{\beta\}_{i=1,\ldots,s,j=1,\ldots,k})$ is reachable from a node $z \in N_0$ if and only if the induced subgraph $G[\{v_1, \ldots, v_r\}]$ admits a list coloring with the lists given by L and with additional constraint that, for each $i = 1, \ldots, s$ and $j = 1, \ldots, k$, color i is forbidden for the last β_i^j vertices in $V^j \cap \{v_1, \ldots, v_r\}$.

In this case, G admits a list coloring if and only if the node t is reachable from a node $z \in N_0$.

Property (∗) will follow from the definition of the set of arcs A, that is given in the following. Let $u = (r, \{\beta_i^j\}_{i=1,\ldots,s,j=1,\ldots,k})$. Note that the problem associated with u has a solution where the vertex v_r gets color i only if $\beta_i^{j(r)} = 0$. Let $C(u) = \{i \in L(r) : \beta_i^{j(r)} = 0\}$ and put exactly $|C(u)|$ arcs entering into u, and give each such arc a color $i \in C(u)$ (exactly one color from $C(u)$ per arc). Each arc $(u', u) \in A$, with $u' \in N_{r-1}$ and $i \in C(u)$, will then have the following meaning: if the constrained sub-problem associated with u' has a solution, i.e., a coloring φ', then we can extend φ' into a solution φ to the constrained sub-problem associated with u by giving color i to vertex v_r.

We now give the formal definition of the set A. We start with the arcs from N_0 to N_1. Let $u = (1, \{\beta_i^j\}_{i=1,\ldots,s,j=1,\ldots,k}) \in N_1$. There is an arc from $z_i, i \in L(1)$, to u if and only if $i \in C(u)$, moreover, the color of its arc is i. We now deal with the arcs from N_{r-1} to N_r, with $2 \leq r \leq n$. Let $u = (r, \{\beta_i^j\}_{i=1,\ldots,s,j=1,\ldots,k}) \in N_r$. As we discussed above, for

each $i^* \in C(u)$, there will be an arc from a node $u_{i^*} \in N_{r-1}$ to u, with color i^*. Namely, $u_{i^*} = (r-1, \{\tilde{\beta}_i^j\}_{i=1,\ldots,s,j=1,\ldots,k})$, where:

$$\tilde{\beta}_i^j = \begin{cases} \max\{|N(v_r,j)_<|, \beta_i^j\} & i = i^* \\ \max\{0, \beta_i^j - 1\} & i \neq i^*, j = j(r) \\ \beta_i^j & i \neq i^*, j \neq j(r) \end{cases} \tag{2}$$

Note that u_{i^*} is indeed a node of N_{r-1}, as the $(sk+1)$-tuple $(r-1, \{\tilde{\beta}_i^j\}_{i=1,\ldots,s,j=1,\ldots,k})$ is such that $0 \leq \tilde{\beta}_i^j \leq \Delta(j)_<$, for each i, j (in fact, $\beta_i^j \leq \Delta(j)_<$, since u is a node of N_r).

▶ **Lemma 21.** *G admits an L list coloring if and only if there is a directed path from a node $z \in N_0$, to t in D. If such a path exists, then a list coloring of G is that assigning each node $v_r, r = 1, \ldots, n$, the color of the arc of the path entering into layer N_r.*

Proof. The proof is analogous to the proof of Lemma 10 in [1] and we ommit it here. ◀

▶ **Theorem 22.** *Suppose that for a (k-thin) graph G with n vertices we are given an ordering and a partition of $V(G)$ into k classes that are consistent. Further consider an instance (G, L) of the list coloring problem. Let $s = \left|\bigcup_{v \in V(G)} L(v)\right|$. Then (G, L) can be solved in $\mathcal{O}(nt^2k \prod_{j=1,\ldots,k} \Delta(j)_<^s)$-time, that is $\mathcal{O}(n^{ks+1}s^2k)$-time.*

Proof. By definition, for $r = 1, \ldots, n-1$, $|N_r| = \prod_{i=1,\ldots,k}(\Delta(j)_< + 1)^s$. Note that each node of D has at most s incoming arcs, and each arc can be built in $\mathcal{O}(sk)$-time. Therefore, D can be built in $\mathcal{O}(ns^2k \prod_{i=1..k}(\Delta(j)_< + 1)^s)$-time. Since D is acyclic, the reachability problem on D can be solved in linear time. Therefore the list coloring problem on G can be solved in $\mathcal{O}(ns^2k \prod_{i=1..k} \Delta(j)_<^s)$-time, that is $\mathcal{O}(n^{ks+1}s^2k)$-time. ◀

▶ **Theorem 23.** *Let G be a co-comparability graph and (G, L) an instance of the list coloring problem with the total number of colors $s \geq 2$. Then (G, L) can be solved in $\mathcal{O}(n^{s^2+1}s^3)$-time. That is polynomial for fixed s.*

Proof. By Theorem 19 a the graph G is k-thin. It can be tested in $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$ time whether the graph G is s-colorable [4]. If it is s-colorable, then by Theorem 19 we get a comparability ordering and a k-partition of $V(G)$. Moreover, by Theorem 19 we know that $k \leq s$. By Theorem 22 can we get a solution in time $\mathcal{O}(n^3 + n^{s^2+1}s^3) = \mathcal{O}(n^{s^2+1}s^3)$. ◀

References

1 Flavia Bonomo, Sara Mattia, and Gianpaolo Oriolo. Bounded coloring of co-comparability graphs and the pickup and delivery tour combination problem. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 412(45):6261–6268, 2011.

2 K. S. Booth and G. S. Lueker. Testing for the consecutive ones property, interval graphs, and planarity using PQ-tree algorithms. *J. Comput. System Sci.*, 13:335–379, 1976.

3 Maw-Shang Chang. Efficient algorithms for the domination problems on interval and circular-arc graphs. *SIAM Journal on computing*, 27(6):1671–1694, 1998.

4 Martin Charles Golumbic. The complexity of comparability graph recognition and coloring. *Computing*, 18(3):199–208, 1977.

5 Carlo Mannino, Gianpaolo Oriolo, Federico Ricci, and Sunil Chandran. The stable set problem and the thinness of a graph. *Operations Research Letters*, 35(1):1–9, 2007.